

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X
MARCO ANTONIO PEREZ PEREZ et al., :
 :
 : ORDER
 :
 Plaintiffs, : 20 Civ. 8010 (LTS) (GWG)
 :
 -v.- :
 :
 ESCOBAR CONSTRUCTION, INC. et al., :
 :
 :
 Defendants. :
-----X

GABRIEL W. GORENSTEIN, United States Magistrate Judge

As to Docket # 152, plaintiffs have filed no response. Accordingly, the Court admonishes plaintiffs' counsel to treat defendants' counsel with the utmost respect. Attorneys should certainly let opposing counsel finish sentences during the meet and confer process

With regard to the discovery disputes raised in Docket ## 151 and 153, the Court has reviewed the parties' letters and rules as follows.

Good cause having been shown, the deadline for the completion of discovery is extended to October 30, 2022. The deadline for the filing of the letter to the undersigned stating a party's intention to file any dispositive motions or class certification motions is extended to October 30, 2022. The Court will set a deadline for the filing of summary judgment and class certification motions at that time, and will also provide a new conference date for the conference before Judge Swain.

Any motion by defendants' attorneys to withdraw from their representation of Natalie Palacios shall be filed on or before August 30, 2022.

Defendants' letter (Docket # 153) fails to address plaintiffs' request for the deposition Luis Monzon. Accordingly, Monzon shall appear for his deposition at 10:00 a.m. on September 14, 2022, at the location designated by plaintiffs' counsel. The parties may change this date by mutual agreement.¹

Defendants have not supplied a copy of the interrogatories at issue but in any event fail to give a coherent explanation as to why the responses are not required to comply with the

¹ While defendants' letter does not address the request for Monzon's deposition, plaintiffs' letter suggests that defendants have not been able to get in touch with him. If such is the case, any motion to withdraw as Monzon's counsel for this reason shall be filed by September 7, 2022.

verification requirement of Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(b)(5). To the extent a response contains solely an objection, the signature of the attorney is sufficient. To the extent, however, that any response consists of something other than an objection — for example, a reference “to other responses or document production” (Docket # 153 at 2) — the party must sign the responses under oath. The Court extends the deadline for a proper response to August 29, 2022.

By September 15, 2022, defendants shall respond to plaintiffs’ Second Document Production Request, and produce all documents as to any request for which no objection is made. .

SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 24, 2022
New York, New York



GABRIEL W. CORENSTEIN
United States Magistrate Judge